



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,682	02/10/2006	Peter DeRosa	SEDN/PRED109	8313
56015 7590 12/16/2008 PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP/ SEDNA PATENT SERVICES, LLC 595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE SUITE 100 SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702				
EXAMINER				
EKPO, NNIENNA NGOZI				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2425				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/16/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/524,682

Applicant(s)

DEROSA, PETER

Examiner

Nnenna N. Ekpo

Art Unit

2425

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 12 and 19-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10, 11 and 13-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 12, 19-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/30/2008 has been entered.
2. This Office Action is responsive to the RCE and Amendment filed on 09/30/2008. Accordingly, claims 1-9 and 12 were previously presented, claims 10-11 and 13-18 are cancelled and claims 19-28 are newly added claims.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 09/30/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. Applicant argues on page 8 of 11 of the 09/30/2008 Remarks that Naimpally et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0105639) nor Aoki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,107,271) taken alone or in combination does not teach, suggest or disclose "audio clips are stored at a distribution head-end" as cited in claim 1.

In response to Applicant's argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Naimpally et al. discloses storing data at the head-end (see abstract, lines 3-14, paragraph 0005). However, the data stored at the head-end of Naimpally et al. is not specifically audio clip which corresponds to a customized viewing recommendations lists.

Aoki et al. discloses customized viewing recommendation lists (see col. 5, lines 34-54).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nairmpally et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Aoki et al. for the advantage of providing programs the user may wish to watch.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. **Claims 19-21 and 27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Aoki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,107,271).

Regarding **claim 19**, Aoki et al. discloses apparatus adapted for use in interactive content distribution system, the apparatus comprising:

a recommendation subsystem configured to generate recommendations of available programs based upon viewer profile information and viewer content selection history, wherein each recommended program has associated with it a respective audio clip (see abstract, figs 3, 17, col. 10, lines 55-col. 11, line 13); and

a viewer subsystem configured to generate audiovisual signals associated with a program selection mechanism, for generating audiovisual signals including audio clips associated with at least one recommended program (see col. 5, lines 61-col. 6, line 28).

Regarding **claim 20**, Aoki et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 19*). Aoki et al. discloses the apparatus wherein the audiovisual signals include image representative signals associated with an EPG (see col. 6, lines 35-40).

Regarding **claim 21**, Aoki et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 19*). Aoki et al. discloses the apparatus wherein the audiovisual signals are adapted for presentation via a television (see col. 7, lines 27-44).

Regarding **claim 27**, Aoki et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 19*). Aoki et al. discloses the apparatus further comprising a speech generating unit configured to provide audio data related to recommended content (see fig 3, col. 5, lines 61-col. 6, line 28).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 1-9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naimpally et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0105639) in view of Aoki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,107,271).

Regarding **claim 1**, Naimpally et al. discloses a smart audio guide system (see fig 1, information appliance (28)) for use in conjunction with an interactive content distribution system (fig 1, integrated television (26)) that includes a distribution head-end (see fig 1, server (20)) that makes programming available for viewing on a video display device (see fig 1, television (30)) at a viewer subsystem (see paragraph 0015), the viewer subsystem including an audio unit (see fig 2, stereo audio speakers (70)) to provide audio for the video display unit, the smart audio guide system comprising (see paragraph 0027, lines 1-5):

a processing unit configured and operative to implement the smart audio guide system functions (see paragraph 0031);

a smart audio guide audio package (speech files) that includes at least a plurality of smart audio guide audio clips (EPG, weather, news information) corresponding to the information (see paragraph 0005, lines 7-12); and

a smart guide actuator (remote control, 72) that is configured and operative in response to one or more predetermined conditions to activate the processing unit (see paragraph 0037-0038);

wherein the plurality of data are generated (converting) by a head-end of the interactive content distribution system and stored (storing) in a database (database) at the head-end (remote location) (see cited portion, but not limited to abstract, lines 3-14,

paragraph 0005, remote location is any location distant from the present or standard location which is equivalent to the head-end. The head-end is remote from the user device), and said processing unit is configured and operative to cause the plurality of smart audio guide audio clips (channel 2-CNN Larry King Live etc) to be uttered in a predetermined mode at the viewer subsystem via the audio unit when activated to identify programs recommended for viewing at the viewer subsystem based upon the program list (see paragraph 0042).

However, Naimpally et al. fail to specifically disclose a recommendation engine for providing a customized viewing-recommendations list for the viewer subsystem based upon the programming available from the interactive content distribution system and a customized viewing profile developed for the viewer subsystem.

Aoki et al. discloses a recommendation engine for providing a customized viewing-recommendations list (EPG information acquisition means, 106) for the viewer subsystem based upon the programming available from the interactive content distribution system and a customized viewing profile (recommendation to the user based on information accumulated in the preference database, 108) developed for the viewer subsystem (see col. 5, lines 34-54).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Naimpally et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Aoki et al. for the advantage of providing programs the user may want to watch.

Regarding **claim 2**, Naimpally et al. and Aoki et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 1*). Naimpally et al. discloses the smart audio guide system wherein the predetermined mode is one wherein the plurality of smart audio guide audio clips (see paragraph 0042, lines 11-15, channel 2-CNN Larry King Live etc) are uttered without (audio mode) a corresponding visual presentation of the program for the viewer subsystem (see paragraph 0036).

Aoki et al. discloses customized viewing-recommendations list (EPG information acquisition means, 106).

Regarding **claim 3**, Naimpally et al. and Aoki et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 1*). Naimpally et al. discloses the smart audio guide system wherein the predetermined mode is one wherein the plurality of smart audio guide audio clips (see paragraph 0042, lines 11-15, channel 2-CNN Larry King Live etc) are uttered in synchronization with a corresponding visual presentation (both visual and audio modes) of the program for the viewer subsystem (see paragraph 0036).

Aoki et al. discloses customized viewing-recommendations list (EPG information acquisition means, 106).

Regarding **claim 4**, Naimpally et al. and Aoki et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 3*). Naimpally et al. discloses the smart audio guide system wherein the corresponding visual presentation is a graphical recommendation menu (EPG), and wherein the processing unit is configured and operative to implement a

focus frame (focused grid) that visually focuses a corresponding program grid of the graphical recommendation menu in synchronization with the utterance of each of the plurality of smart audio guide audio clips (see paragraph 0049).

Regarding **claim 5**, Naimpally et al. and Aoki et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 3*). Naimpally et al. discloses the smart audio guide system wherein corresponding visual presentation is an electronic program guide (EPG) and wherein the processing unit is configured and operative to implement a focus frame (focused grid) that visually focuses a corresponding program grid of the electronic program guide in synchronization with the utterance of each of the plurality of smart audio guide audio clips (see paragraph 0049).

Regarding **claim 6**, Naimpally et al. and Aoki et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 1*). Naimpally et al. discloses the smart audio guide system further comprising a speech generating unit (audio speaker), and wherein the smart audio guide audio package further comprises a plurality of smart audio guide text files (speech files); and wherein the processing unit is configured and operative to implement the speech generating unit to convert the plurality of smart audio guide text files into the plurality of smart audio guide audio clips (see abstract, lines 3-14 and fig 1 (18 and 22)).

Regarding **claim 7**, Naimpally et al. and Aoki et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 1*). Naimpally et al. discloses the smart audio guide system wherein the viewer subsystem further includes a viewer control unit (see paragraph 0033, (infrared remote control, 72)) and wherein the smart audio guide actuator comprises a button on the viewer control unit, which when depressed, activates the processing unit to cause the plurality of smart audio guide audio clips to be uttered in the predetermined mode at the viewer subsystem via the audio unit (see paragraph 0037-0038).

Regarding **claim 8**, Naimpally et al. and Aoki et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 1*). Naimpally et al. discloses the smart audio guide system wherein the smart audio guide actuator (remote control) comprises a set of instructions that activates the processing unit to cause the plurality of smart audio guide audio clips (channel 2-CNN Larry King Live etc) to be uttered in the predetermined mode at the viewer subsystem via the audio unit (see paragraph 0042).

Aoki et al. discloses the video display device (TV set) at the viewer subsystem is initially activated (when the program started) (see col. 7, lines 45-63).

Regarding **claim 9**, Naimpally et al. and Aoki et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 1*). Naimpally et al. discloses the smart audio guide system wherein the smart audio guide actuator (remote control) comprises a set of instructions that activates the processing unit to cause the plurality of smart audio guide audio clips

(channel 2-CNN Larry King Live etc) to be uttered in the predetermined mode at the viewer subsystem via the audio unit (see paragraph 0042).

Aoki et al. discloses at the conclusion of a programming period (program ended) (see col. 7, lines 58-61).

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naimpally et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0105639) and Aoki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,107,271) as applied to *claim 1* above, and further in view of Chang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,328,159).

Regarding **claim 12**, Naimpally et al. and Aoki et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 1*). However, Naimpally et al. and Aoki et al. are silent on the processing unit is configured and operative to temporarily discontinue the audio associated with programming being displayed via the video display device at the viewer subsystem when the plurality of smart audio guide clips are being uttered in a predetermined mode at the viewer subsystem via the audio unit.

Chang et al. discloses the processing unit is configured and operative to temporarily discontinue the audio associated with programming being displayed via the video display device at the viewer subsystem when the plurality of smart audio guide clips are being uttered in a predetermined mode at the viewer subsystem via the audio unit (see col. 2, lines 50-57).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Naimpally et al. and Aoki et al.'s invention

with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Chang et al. for the advantage of accepting voice input.

Claims 22 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,107,271) as applied to *claim 19* above, and further in view of Naimpally et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0105639).

Regarding **claim 22**, Aoki et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 19*). Aoki et al. discloses audio clips (customized viewing recommendation lists) (*see col. 5, lines 34-54*).

However, Aoki et al. is silent on the apparatus wherein programs and their respective data are stored at a database at a head end within the interactive content distribution system.

Naimpally et al. et al. discloses the apparatus wherein programs and their respective data are stored at a database at a head end within the interactive content distribution system (*see abstract, lines 3-14, paragraph 0005*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Aoki et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Naimpally et al. et al. for the advantage of storing programs at the server.

Regarding **claim 28**, Aoki et al. discloses method adapted for use in interactive content distribution system, the method comprising:

generating recommendations of available programs based upon viewer profile information and viewer content selection history, wherein each recommended program has associated with it a respective audio clip (see abstract, fig 17, col. 10, lines 55-col. 11, line 13);

generating audiovisual signals associated with a program selection mechanism, the audiovisual signals including at least one retrieved audio clip (see col. 5, lines 61-col. 6, line 28); and audio clips (customized viewing recommendation) (see col. 5, lines 34-54).

However, Aoki et al. fails to specifically disclose retrieving, from a head end, at least one audio associated with a data.

Naipally et al. discloses retrieving, from a head end, at least one audio associated with a data (see paragraph 0022).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Aoki et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Naipally et al. et al. for the advantage of downloading content from the server.

Claims 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,107,271) as applied to *claim 19* above, and further in view of Ellis (U.S. Patent No. 7,370,343).

Regarding **claim 23**, Aoki et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 20*). However, Aoki et al. fails to specifically disclose the apparatus wherein

normal presentation of the EPG is modified in response to the presence of recommended content within an EPG page.

Ellis discloses the apparatus wherein normal presentation of the EPG is modified in response to the presence of recommended content within an EPG page (see col. 21, lines 56-col. 22, line 9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Aoki et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Ellis for the advantage of updating an EPG.

Regarding **claim 24**, Aoki et al. and Ellis discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 20*). Ellis discloses the apparatus wherein an audio clip associated with recommended content is presented in response to the presence of recommended content within an EPG page (see col. 19, lines 21-45).

Regarding **claim 25**, Aoki et al. and Ellis discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 24*). Ellis discloses the apparatus wherein an audio clip associated with recommended content is presented in response to user manipulation of the EPG to potentially recommended content (see col. 19, lines 54-65).

Regarding **claim 26**, Aoki et al. and Ellis discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 19*). Aoki et al. discloses each of a plurality of audio clips associated with recommended content is presented (see fig 16, col. 10, lines 40-54).

However, Aoki et al. fails to specifically disclose the apparatus wherein in response to a user selection of a predefined graphical button.

Ellis discloses the apparatus wherein in response to a user selection of a predefined graphical button each of a plurality of audio clips associated with recommended content is presented (see col. 16, lines 39-col. 17, line 9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Aoki et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Ellis for the advantage of expanding the graphical button of the recommended program.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nnenna N. Ekpo whose telephone number is 571-270-1663. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 AM-5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Pendleton can be reached on 571-272-7527. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/N.N.E./
Patent Examiner
November 26, 2008.

/Brian T. Pendleton/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2425

